

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 16, and 17 are amended to more distinctly claim the present invention. Claims 4 and 13 are canceled by this response. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by this response.

Claims 1-3, 9 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,787,382 to Kurabayashi (hereinafter Kurabayashi). Claims 4, 7-8, 13 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurabayashi in view of US Patent No. 6,424,911 to Yamashita et al. (hereinafter Yamashita). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following amendments and arguments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 9 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurbayashi.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a vehicle navigation method for accurately guiding the path of a complex intersection and includes “reconstructing a path guidance data of the complex intersection by performing a grouping using the extracted sharing node and link of the complex intersection, and by patterning the grouped complex intersection.” The claim limitation of canceled claim 4 has been amended to claim 1 to further distinguish the subject matter of claim 1.

Kurabayashi does not disclose the recited claim limitations of claim 1. On page 3 of the Office Action, with respect to claims 4 and 13, the Examiner indicates that Kurabayashi fails to disclose "the step of reconstructing the path guidance data comprises the steps of performing a grouping by using the sharing node and link of the complex intersection and patterning the grouped complex intersection." Therefore, Kurabayashi fails as an anticipating reference.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that because Kurabayashi fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 is allowable. Dependent claims 2, 3 and 9, are believed to allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1.

With respect to claim 10, claim limitations similar to those of allowable claim 1 are recited therein. Specifically, claim 10 has been amended to include "the means for reconstructing the path guidance data comprises means for performing a grouping by using the sharing node and link of the complex intersection, and means for patterning the grouped complex intersection." For reasons previously asserted with respect to claim 1, Applicant believes claim 10 is allowable. Dependent claims 11-12 are also believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 10.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 7-8, 13 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurabayashi in view of Yamashita. On page 3 of the Office Action,

rejections for claims 5-6 and 14-15 were not listed in the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), but the rejections are detailed on page 4 of the Office Action for the identified claims. Applicant assumes the omitted listings were in error.

Claims 4 and 13 are canceled by this response, and the subject matter recited therein has been amended into claim 1 and claim 10, respectively. Claim 1 is directed toward a vehicle navigation method for guiding path of a complex intersection and includes “reconstructing a path guidance data of the complex intersection by performing a grouping using the extracted sharing node and link of the complex intersection, and by patterning the grouped complex intersection.”

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Kurabayashi fails to disclose “the step of reconstructing the path guidance data comprises the steps of performing a grouping by using the sharing node and link of the complex intersection and patterning the grouped complex intersection.” However, the Examiner further asserts that Yamashita supplies the deficiencies of Kurabayashi.

With regard to the above-identified claim features, page 3 of the Office Action refers to Yamashita at col. 14, lines 1-8, which is reproduced in part as follows:

“First, referring to FIGS. 3 and 4, the intersection shape generation part 5 receives the route information from the route search part 3 and reads map data in the area near the route from the map data storage part 2 (step S11). The intersection shape generation part 5 extracts one intersection (intersection node) existing on the route from the read map data, and further extracts road links connected to the extracted intersection (hereinafter, these road links are referred to as intersection-connected links) (step S12).” Emphasis added.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is distinguishable for several reasons. First, the Yamashita reference discloses a method for an intersection shape generation for extracting one intersection (intersection node), i.e. a simple intersection, not a

complex intersection, as recited in claim 1. Yamashita fails to disclose or suggest reconstructing a path guidance for a complex intersection.

A second distinction is that claim 1 recites "performing a grouping using the extracted sharing node and link of the complex intersection." Yamashita makes absolutely no mention of performing a grouping using complex intersection. Instead, Yamashita discloses extracting road links connected to the one extracted intersection node. Furthermore, Yamashita fails to disclose "patterning the grouped complex intersection," as recited in claim 1. Rather, an intersection display disclosed by Yamashita determines right and left side lines of the intersection-connected link for the intersection shape generation.

Because of these deficiencies, Yamashita cannot teach or suggest the deficient claim features of Kurabayashi. Accordingly, Applicant submits that even if Kurabayashi and Yamashita were combined in the manner asserted the invention of claim 1 would be allowable. Dependent claims 5-8 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable claim 1.

As previously stated, claim 10 has been amended to capture the subject matter of canceled claim 13 and recite similar limitations as claim 1, therefore for reasons similar to those asserted with respect to claim 1, Applicant believes claim 10 is allowable. Dependent claims 14-17 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable claim 10.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application and the claims are in condition for reconsideration on the merits, thus reexamination of the application is requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (213) 623-2221 should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: September 21, 2007

Customer No. 035884

By:

Vernon R. Yancy
Registration No. 52,379
Attorney for Applicant

